

REMARKS

This is in response to the Advisory Action dated January 10, 2005 and the Final Office Action dated October 6, 2004. Claims 1-18 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Claims 1-10, 19 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gudjonsson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,564,261. The Examiner stated essentially that Gudjonsson teaches all the claimed limitations of claims 1-10, 19 and 20.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "displaying a user representation within the abstract graphical display incorporating the user data to the user, wherein the user representation appears at a location in the two-dimensional space according to a level of user activity over time."

Gudjonsson teaches a contact list of users (see Figure 8 and col. 11, line 43 to col. 12, line 18). Gudjonsson fails to teach "displaying a user representation within the abstract graphical display incorporating the user data to the user, wherein the user representation appears at a location in the two-dimensional space according to a level of user activity over time" as claimed in claim 1. Gudjonsson's list of users is a one-dimensional representation of users. The list of Gudjonsson is not analogous to "displaying a user representation within the abstract graphical display incorporating the user data to the user, wherein the user representation appears at a location in the two-dimensional space according to a level of user activity over time" as claimed in claim 1. For example, Gudjonsson does not teach that a user representation in the list appears at a location according to a level of user activity, much less a two-dimensional space over time. Therefore, Gudjonsson does not teach every limitation of claim 1.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1. Claims 19-20 have been cancelled. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable to at least the reasons given for claim 1. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gudjonsson in view of Scott et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,638,504). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Gudjonsson and Scott teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 11-18.

Claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, "displaying the user proxy within the geometric shape defining the boundary of the virtual environment."

Gudjonsson teaches a contact list (see Figure 8 and col. 11, line 43 to col. 12, line 18). Gudjonsson does not teach or suggest, "displaying the user proxy within the geometric shape defining the boundary of the virtual environment" as claimed in claim 11. The contact list of Gudjonsson does not have a boundary, much less a geometric shape defining a boundary, essentially as claimed in claim 11. Gudjonsson does not teach or suggest a geometric shape defining a boundary of a virtual environment. Therefore, Gudjonsson fails to teach all the limitations of claim 11.

Scott teaches a system for providing system level support for document processing (see Abstract). Scott teaches a proxy for document processing, appearing as an illustration of a page (see Figure 2). Scott does not teach or suggest a social proxy for a virtual environment having a geometric shape, essentially as claimed in claim 11. The proxy of Scott represents document management functions. Document management functions as taught by Scott are not a representation of a virtual environment. Thus, Scott fails to teach or suggest, "displaying the

user proxy within the geometric shape defining the boundary of the virtual environment" as claimed in claim 11. Therefore, Scott fails to cure the deficiencies of Gudjonsson.

Neither Gudjonsson nor Scott, either together or in combination teach or suggest, "displaying the user proxy within the geometric shape defining the boundary of the virtual environment" as claimed in claim 11.

Claims 12-18 depend from claim 11. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 11. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, the application, including claims 1-18, is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons stated. The Examiner's withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested. For the forgoing reasons, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889